

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 3-4, 7-8, 12-13 and 18-20 have been canceled by this amendment.

### Examiner's Interview

Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for his time on Friday, March 9, 2007, and Tuesday, March 13, 2007. The Examiner's insights into the amendments he considers necessary to move this case towards allowance were very helpful and are reflected in the current amendments to the claims.

### Response

Claims 15-17 were objected to. Claim 15 has been amended to overcome this rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The office action gave two aspects of the claims found to be indefinite. First, the office action found the claims lacking in clarity as to the term 'a number of fuses.' The amendments to the claims above clarify to 'a number of fuses in the fuse bank.'

Second, the office action found that the claims 'fails to clarify in what sense the two relevant items are in recited "directly proportional" relationship, given that the claim is directed to an individual final product. Applicants have amended the claims to set out the relationship between the various dimensions of the fuse bank and its lateral size. It is submitted that these amendments have overcome the objections and request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoon.

The discussion as to the 'coefficient (k) to satisfy the direct proportional relationship between S and the production of N and P...' is irrelevant, as Yoon does not discuss any pitch dimension.

Further, the pitch (P) discussed in the office appears to be a pitch between the fuses, although the exact nature of the pitch (P) is not explained. In the relationship given in the office action, it would seem that that lateral size would increase a same proportion between fuse banks having more fuses than others. This relationship does not hold true for the current claims, nor does it hold true for Yoon. As discussed in Yoon, the lateral size does not increase a same proportion for different angles between the fuses. See Yoon, col. 5, lines 2-12.

Yoon does not disclose a fuse bank in which the lateral size of the fuse bank is *equal to a number of fuses in the fuse bank minus one multiplied by a pitch between the connecting lines, plus twice the width of the connecting lines, plus a length of the laser fusing region*, as required by the claims. In Yoon, the lateral size of the fuse bank appears to be the dimensions W2 in Figure 2 and W3 in Figure 3. The lateral size, as defined in the Applicants' specification, corresponds to the left-right dimension of the parallelogram 330 and the rectangle 430 in Figures 3 and 4, with the fuses oriented in a 'stacked' type of configuration within the bank. In order to orient the fuses in the fuse banks of FIG. 2 and FIG. 3 of Yoon, one would view the fuse banks from the bottom of the page oriented in 'portrait' orientation, rather than 'landscape' as the figures are drawn in Yoon.

Looking at the fuse banks of Yoon in this aspect, one can see that the lateral dimensions of the fuse banks are W2 and W3. The difference between W2 and W3 in FIG. 2 and FIG. 3 *depends upon the angle  $\theta$ , 45 degrees in FIG. 2 and 70 degrees in FIG. 3* (col. 4, lines 47-65).

The pitch between the terminal ends of the laser fuses, analogous to the connecting lines and connecting line regions, in the current claims, is either E2 or E3, which are the same as the pitch between the fuses. In the example given in Yoon, E2 and E3 are equal. Therefore, the lateral size of the fuse bank in Yoon is not directly proportional, *or in any way related*, to the 'pitch between the connecting line regions...' as required by the claims.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.


Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 10-20, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon, in view of AAPA and/or Sakuta.

For the reasons as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 above, it is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested. The AAPA and Sakuta do not cure the deficiencies of Yoon set forth above.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Alan T. McCollom', is written over a horizontal line.

Alan T. McCollom  
Reg. No. 28,881

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
503-222-3613

**Customer No. 20575**